VOL. 11, NO. 23 DECEMBER 9, 1961

NATIONAL REVIEW

Bulletin

The Right to be Right pp. 1, 6

UN Gasping p. 2

Senate Minus Bridges p. 4

EDITOR: William F. Buckley Jr. PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher
EDITORS: L. Brent Bozell, James Burnham, Willmoore Kendall, Frank S. Meyer, William F. Rickenbacker
MANAGING EDITOR: Priscilla L. Buckley

Whew! If anyone needs a crash program for fallout shelters, it looks as if it's American conservatives and right-wingers—the "Extreme Right," as we all call ourselves nowadays. Why, it beats Nikita Khrushchev seven ways to Sunday, this latest series of blasts in the public atmosphere! Pretty soon the air will be so saturated that even upwind nobody will be safe. First came the rumbling of those underground tests conducted by the *Worker*—hardly enough to set the political seismographs jiggling, you'd have thought. But the technicians were evidently preparing the big bombs all through the moratorium. (Those negotiations about "bipartisanship" and "national unity in confronting the challenge" were just to fool us, it turns out.) A couple of weeks ago they were ready to go, and then, Bing! Bang! Bong! A low yield background trio from the *New York Times*, followed by a batch of kilotonners from the *Washington Post*. (Off along Tobacco Road, pops and sputtering from the junior arson squad—Ralph McGill, James Wechsler, Drew Pearson, John Crosby, Yokum, Pogo, and the usual professors.) Then into the megaton range: ex-President Eisenhower, flown to target, dropped square on studio CBS, and triggered by Walter Cronkite with a penetration of headlines to the top of every Liberal front page in the nation; a new triple-threat technique displayed in project Kennedy-West, with the single explosive device carried by modified B-52 (known to civilians as 707) to three separate locations in an ascending sequence climaxed by a super-colossal Bang in—where else could it appropriately have been?—Hollywood; *Newsweek*, with its "Thunder on the Right" reverberating through the longest cover-story (Dec. 4 issue) in its history; and, natch, the *Times* Sunday Magazine (Nov. 26) launching a particle-buster by Alan Barth whose continental yield made up in radioactive dirt what it lacked in solid power.

They're on the verge, they say, of a breakthrough neutron device that will destroy the reasoning process without leaving any external marks. Then just everybody will repeat the multiple equation in unison: anti-Communist=reactionary=warmonger=fanatic=anti-Semite=anti-Negro=fascist.

Huddled here under our protective shield of the *Federalist* and a reinforced copy of the Constitution, it occurred to us that the massive scale of this Preventive Strike might suggest: a) that the Powers-that-Be sound sort of scared about what is happening Out There (out beyond the Bureaus, that is: see page 6); and/or b) that they may be laying down a barrage to cover a deal on Berlin, Laos, Cuba and parts north, east, south and west that will make Munich read like Bunker Hill.

Well, Robert Welch can be proud of one thing anyway. Messrs. Eisenhower and Kennedy, *Newsweek*, the *Times* and Chester (Chuck) Bowles have all swung round to the doctrine that the Menace is Internal.

The WEEK

● In his debate (it is silly to call it an "interview") with Khrushchev's son-in-law, the editor of *Izvestia*, President Kennedy withdrew the claim to four-power rights in East Berlin, offered to withdraw four-power control of the corridors in favor of "international control," and declared: 1) "There is no military power that can [invade the Soviet Union.]" 2) "We recognize that today the Soviet Union does not intend to permit German reunification, and that as long as the Soviet Union has that policy Germany will not be reunified." 3) "I would be extremely reluctant to see West Germany acquire a nuclear capacity of its own." 4) "If any nation should choose a Communist system, we would recognize and accept that." How's that for Standing Firm?

● Senator Paul Douglas (D., Ill.) tried his best to save the taxpayers a few dollars on his last jaunt to Europe, but the Foreign Service chaperons just wouldn't hear of it. In Munich the modest Senator requested reservations at the Platzl Hotel, which the guide books list as "economy." The State Department, Munich office, wired back swiftly: "Unless Senator has strong personal desire to stay at this hotel, Consul General recommends against it. . . . Have also reserved rooms Hotel Vier Jahreszeiten which Consul General strongly recommends Senator accept." The Vier Jahreszeiten, as your Fielding will tell you, is a long way from an "economy" rating. So too

in Berlin, where he requested a room at the old-line Amzoo Hotel, and got the new, top price Hilton. And in Paris, where he wanted reservations at the Left Bank Pont Royal, but got the super-deluxe George V. After all, you can't ask Foreign Service host-officers to call for visitors in the *slums*, can you?

● Conservatives in Arkansas have launched a full-scale attack on Senator J. William Fulbright, up for re-election next year, and the Senator is beginning to respond. Criticism centers around Fulbright's foreign policy stands —his defense of the sale of jet trainers to Communist Yugoslavia, his suggestion that a too rigid American policy was partly responsible for the Berlin and Cuban crises, and, especially, his memorandum recommending the muzzling of the military. Fulbright has all of the advantages of the incumbent: patronage, power and prestige built up over the years, not to speak of the cooperation of Stewart Udall's Interior Department in placing public-works projects in Arkansas. But he knows he is in trouble. If Fulbright is defeated in the primary next July, the soft-on-Communism issue may become the dominant theme of the campaigns.

© *Punch*, Ben Roth Agency

"Officially it's an unofficial strike, but unofficially it's an official one."

● In the week that ended November 22 U. S. gold reserves sank by $300 million, the largest weekly loss ever recorded, to a level of $16.976 billion. This was the lowest point since October 11, 1939, and meant the lowest ratio ever recorded between gold reserves and purchasing media in circulation. This latest loss of gold only makes a run on the dollar more probable. For the amount of net foreign short-term claims on United States gold exceeds three times the amount of gold we have available after allowing for the statutory currency reserve. With rising imports, and continuing massive foreign grants, our trade balance is declining; with a federal deficit in the neighborhood of $10 billion in the current fiscal year, we can hardly lay claim to any effort to maintain sound monetary policies. No announcement of Treasury, no brave rhetoric from the White House, can alter the facts or reduce the danger of a real run on the dollar. Only actions tell: and the action needed is a reversal of just about every monetary and fiscal policy so far enunciated by the Kennedy Administration.

● At the Hollywood Palladium Nov. 18 President Kennedy denounced as "extremists . . . on the fringes of our society" those who believe there was "a sell-out at Yalta, that it was not a civil war that removed China from the free world, it was treason in high places," etc., etc. The other day Rep. Donald C. Bruce (R., Ind.) ran across a speech delivered Jan. 30, 1949 in Salem, Mass. by a junior congressman from that state, John F. Kennedy by name. Rep. Kennedy assailed the China policy of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, declared that they and their diplomats had "frittered away . . . what our young men had saved," and singled out for special attack "a sick Roosevelt" who had given "the Kurile Islands as well as the control of various strategic Chinese ports . . . to the Soviet Union" at Yalta. They say he was a terrible extremist, that young Massachusetts fellow.

Decline and Fall of the UN

In the week that ended November 28 the United Nations solved all the world's problems. The General Assembly urged the United States and the Soviet Union to create a method for negotiating general and complete disarmament. The Special Political Committee called on Austria and Italy to agree on a settlement of the dispute over Alto Adige. The Security Council directed the Secretary General to subdue Katanga by armed force. The General Assembly proclaimed that the use of nuclear weapons violates the Charter, especially in Africa. The Special Political Committee demanded that South Africa improve its treatment of Indian and Pakistani residents. The Budgetary Committee established the scale of assessments for UN expenses through 1964. The General Assembly formed a committee to find out how the world has complied with last year's resolution abolishing colonialism. The Economic Committee resolved to increase the UN's aid to backward nations during the next ten years. The General Assembly condemned South Africa's *apartheid* policy, and demanded immediate freedom for Angola. The Budgetary Committee voted to raise the educational allowance for staff members who have children.

Out of this flurry, two facts emerge which carry ominous implications for the UN's future. First, on issue after issue, the major Western nations, and sometimes also the Communist bloc, have begun to abstain from voting. The resolutions of the Assembly are becoming the expressions

of heedless opinions voiced by a jumble of irresponsible pseudo-nations. And so the major nations, both East and West, are beginning simply to ignore the buzzing gnats. When a political body is ignored, it is on its way out.

Second, it becomes ever more obvious that the imperious pronouncements of the General Assembly bear no relation to the actual capacity of the UN to act upon its opinions. If neither the Soviet Union nor the United States dare disarm, of what use is a UN demand? Italy and Austria don't enjoy the snarl in Alto Adige; they would settle it if they could; what help is a barren UN instruction? The UN has already flopped in the Congo. Is it going to destroy Tshombe by passing more motions? If nuclear warfare violates the Charter, will the General Assembly expel the major nations if they engage in nuclear warfare? Of what use is it to establish the scale of assessments for nations that won't pay them? If the UN discovers that the world, East and West, has not complied with its resolution abolishing colonialism, what will the UN *do* about it? If South Africa denies UN jurisdiction over its internal policies, of what use is the Assembly's demand for changes?

When a political body is ignored, it is on its way out. And when it lacks the power to impose its will on those who ignore it, it is already dead on its feet. The UN never had and never will have such power. It can prosper only when it enjoys the respectful attention of the majority of industrialized nations. And it has now, obviously, lost that respect. It should appoint one final committee: to indite an epitaph for that forty-story gravestone on the East River.

Registration Day

On November 20, the Communist Party of America failed to register with the Justice Department as an active agent of the Soviet Union as required by the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. On November 30, the officers of the Party failed to register, and it's a safe bet that there'll be no knocking down of Justice Department doors on December 20 when the registration deadline runs out for the rest of the Party members.

It has been more than eleven years since the law requiring Communists and other foreign agents to register was passed, but it was only last summer, after a marathon series of court battles, that the Supreme Court upheld (5-4) the constitutionality of the Act and subsequently set the November-December deadlines. The penalties for non-compliance are severe: up to $10,000 fines a day for the Party and both fines and hefty jail sentences for individual leaders who persist in flaunting the law.

If the law is rigorously applied, as Attorney General Robert Kennedy has promised it will be, a clamp would be placed on the open apparatus of the Communist Party and its effectiveness thereby impaired. Which would be a considerable net gain. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the Party will cease to function if the Attorney

PEOPLE: Another **Taft** in Ohio: **Robert Jr.,** majority leader in state legislature, expected to run for governor next year. GOP given good chance of winning contest if Gov. **Mike DiSalle** holds to decision not to go for second term. . . . Opposing **Richard Nixon** in California Republican primary, California assemblyman **Joseph Shell,** long-time favorite of local conservatives, and for past three years Republican floor leader in state Assembly. . . . If Nixon gets nomination and runs well (that is to say wins by 200,000 or more) the pressures will be on him to run again for President in '64—particularly since divorce may lower **Rocky's** winning margin in N.Y. . . . **Kenneth Kohler** made it in Texas: his victory in Potter County special election makes him only Republican in the state legislature.

Rep. **Frank Kowalski** first man to toss hat in ring for Democratic senatorial nomination in Connecticut but the pros expect the plum will go to former governor, Healthy, Wealthy and Wise Secretary **Ribicoff.** . . . **Prescott Bush,** the Republican incumbent, warned solemnly last week by moderate *Hartford Courant* against "fishing for votes in the troubled waters of the extreme right." Seems Bush opposes Red China entry into UN. . . . **John Crosby** on "Open End" last week commented that we must not press **Khrushchev** (that old Soviet moderate) too hard because he has to contend with his own **Goldwaters** in the Kremlin.

Paris meeting two weeks ago of opposition Committee of Vincennes (pro-*Algérie Française*) broken up by de Gaulle's police. Two former premiers, **Maurice Bourgès-Maunoury** and **Georges Bidault** questioned, then released; National Assembly Deputy **Jean Dides** arrested; the Committee ordered to disband. . . . This year's Prix Goncourt (France's most prestigious novel award) given to **Jean Cau's** *La Pitié de Dieu.* Cau is former **Jean-Paul Sartre** secretary, a far-leftist FLN supporter. . . . **Roberto Holden,** Soviet-trained leader of Angola rebels, responsible for the torture-killing of several thousand Angolans, finds welcome mat in U. S. at moment when even Portuguese rebel pirate, Capt. **Galvao** repudiates his ferocities.

News executives of *N. Y. Times* told an *NR* reviewer (Dr. **Joseph Thorning**) in September of this year that they have refused to recognize **Herbert L. Matthews** as anything but a "bad reporter" since July 14, 1959 (when the *Times* published the first of a never-completed Matthews series on **Castro's** first six months in power) and that "over our dead bodies" would Matthews ever again receive a news assignment from the *Times.*

General now does his duty. The Communist apparatus will continue to carry out clandestine operations; its couriers and espionage nets will get on with the job; its agents will fan pacifist and neutralist sentiment on the campuses; its fronts, dupes and sympathizers, old and new, will be in there, as they are now, taking full page ads in newspapers, running rallies, picketing the White House, whispering in receptive ears.

The Subversive Activities Control Act is only one of the needed instruments for the neutralization of the Communist organization in America. But the way in which the law is now enforced will prove significant. It could be a sign of the emphasis the Kennedy Administration places on the Communist problem; a gauge of the quality of its own anti-Communism.

What's Finland to Russia?

In Novosibirsk, on November 24, President Urho Kekkonen of Finland met with Nikita Khrushchev, ostensibly to discuss the common defense of Finland and Russia against the "Hitlerite generals" of West Germany. But Khrushchev's maneuver has other meanings.

There was the possibility that Kekkonen (who has seldom said no to Nikita) might be defeated in the coming presidential elections by Olavi Honka, a former Chief Justice, who had the support of most political parties and all Finnish anti-Communists. The winter atmosphere of Novosibirsk had its effect: Mr. Honka withdrew his candidacy the evening of the day Kekkonen met Khrushchev. So Finland's head of state will not be unfriendly toward Russia.

There was the announcement, November 22, that NATO had begun a series of conferences with Denmark and Norway on the creation of a Baltic Naval Command. For more than a thousand years the Baltic area served as a main invasion route into Russia, and is still one of her most "sensitive" flanks. Russia's response to the threat of hostile Baltic power was logical: to intimidate the Scandinavian nations, starting with the one most easily intimidated.

There was the swiftly gathering strength of the Common Market, which, on top of Britain's bid for membership, had begun to attract the traditionally neutral nations—Switzerland, Austria, Sweden. If the logic of the Common Market led the neutrals to an anti-Communist position, the logic of Russia's defense—and even more of her propaganda—required her to identify the Common Market with NATO, German militarism, and the sufferings of Scandinavia at Nazi hands in World War II.

There was the Berlin situation, now stabilized by The Wall, the logic of which required Russia to put the wall into legal form by signing a separate peace treaty with East Germany, acknowledging the boundary now built of brick and barbed wire: with the prospect that the neutral nations might recognize East Germany in the guise of another "peaceful neutral."

• At Home •

Washington

Styles Bridges' death, coming so soon after Mr. Sam's, reminded many of the old-timers, paradoxically, more of what these two Capitol giants had in common than of their manifest differences. In specific social and economic views, in crystallized political tendency, they were at nearly opposite ends of that portion of the national spectrum that is reflected on the Hill. But each was a classical, a storybook, product not only of the general American tradition but of that key institution of our governmental system, the Congress. Both were sons of small farmers, both were out in the fields from early childhood, both worked their way through college and had a year or two of teaching to start their careers. But both were predestined for political life. They shifted quickly to the hustings, were immediately and always victorious, and rose rapidly, American-style, to the top range of their chosen branch. Both were characteristically and pre-eminently Members of Congress: shrewd, skilled and infinitely experienced from decades of service—each was at his death a senior Member of his House—in the ways of that most subtle product of our Constitution. Such once typical American prototypes are rare now, that sort of career being ruled out of the automated and welfare state by definition. The double death leaves in Congress a hole that will be patched but not filled.

And the hole left where Styles Bridges stood is right now a large one. Bridges was not only chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee but ranking minority member in the powerful Appropriations Committee and Armed Services Committee. Though a thoroughly professional political leader who knew that popular government requires practical adjustment and decent compromise, he was one of the few among us who did not yield on first things. He was never deceived by Bolshevism, and he therefore fought its appeasement in whatever form this loomed—a Yalta deal, a welcome to the UN or the White House, or a coddling of a Cuban puppet. He did not deny the duty of government to foster conditions favorable to the people's welfare, but he despised the servile welfare state and consistently opposed its excesses. There are not many of such clear definition among the surviving band of Senate Republicans. Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, so moderate that even the *Washington Post* could never accuse him of *any* extreme, is in normal line of succession for the Policy Committee chairmanship. It is said that he is not anxious for the job, and that Everett Dirksen is resolved he shall not have it, preferring Kentucky's Thruston Morton. For conservatives, the choice of Morton, how-

ever far from ideal, would probably be the best at hand. Actually, the Policy Committee is in a poor way, and had counted for little, even before Bridges' health sank, which was a long time ago. The Committee has been in the hands, largely, of its staff chief, Arthur Burgess, who specializes in anti-Goldwaterism. Out of a total budget of $180,000, Burgess has been allocating $125,000 to salaries—mostly for himself, his relatives and cronies.

So they finally chucked out Chester. He had to go, of course, and everybody in town has known it ever since he tried to squirm out of the Cuban rap. And he's gone, of course. Not all the fancy titles and $2,500 salary jump and two-place move up the protocol list can make a Missionary-at-Large to the world's cannibals and head-hunters equal, in the stuff that Washington's power's made of, to an Under Secretary with a hand on the organizational levers. The only wonder here is how Bowles' hide can be so rhinoceros-thick that he hasn't been shamed into resigning. Is there another man here who could walk unblushing into a Washington drawing room after what Chester has had done to him? No one, not even the President and his brother, can be *quite* sure of the full meaning of Big Shakeup #1. Everyone seems agreed that it does not signify anything much in the way of a policy change. It was a reshuffling, not a purge, and part of the reason, certainly, was an attempt to fit tasks and individuals more smoothly together than had been possible in the first round of payoffs.

It is worth remarking that the State Department shift came the day after a decree by Secretary of Defense McNamara that put an end to the traditional liaison between each of the several armed services and Congress. Henceforth all military relations with Congress will be channeled exclusively through Mr. McNamara's Assistant Secretary, Norman S. Paul. Now one effect of this Defense move is in the same line as the State operation. These two primary agencies are being brought more totally under centralized Presidential control. In State, the President is getting rid of a maverick who was forced on him in the first place, and transferring *his own* men —Goodman, Dutton, Rostow—direct from the White House to critical control spots in the agency. Similarly, the military is being cut off from its semi-autonomous link with the branch of government that is, or was, constitutionally ordained "to declare war . . ., raise and support armies . . ., provide and maintain a navy [and] make rules for the government and regulation of the armed forces." It is well known that Mr. Kennedy has long adhered to the doctrine of "executive supremacy," and this he evidently aims to carry into ever fuller practice, even if he doesn't yet know what he wants to be supreme about.

QUINCY

Military defense of the Baltic; assurance of a neutral Finland; the attempt to split Scandinavia off from the NATO alliance; the effort to keep neutral nations out of the Common Market—these are the meanings of the meeting in Novosibirsk.

BRIEFS: Since The Wall went up, over 400 East German policemen and soldiers—the equivalent of three companies—have deserted to the West. . . . NATO Supreme Commander Norstad expects to have 25 combat-ready divisions in the field early in 1962 as against 21 over-all, only 15 combat-ready, in July. . . . To counter OAS (the rightist secret army) in Algeria, an opposition group, the OCC *(Organization Clandestin du Contingent)* has been set up, mostly staffed by French draftees who have by and large opposed service in Algeria. . . . **Most lawyers who've taken a look at the UN report on Lumumba's death (Tshombe was the villain) say it would be laughed out of any court. . . .** Refeened talk at the UN by Mali delegate in debate on South-West Africa: "If all the Africans who object to the form of government in South Africa could spit together, they would create such a stream of spit as would wash away the government and the white people of South Africa."

There's a move on to rehabilitate former State Department officer ("China expert") John Paton Davies, fired in 1954 after lengthy security investigation. *N.Y. Times'* Cyrus Sulzburger devoted whole column a week ago to "injustice" done Davies; Charlton Ogburn, in Dec. *Holiday*, mentioned Davies as "perceptive, capable and courageous officer" "thrown to the wolves." . . . **Dr. Harold Urey has appealed to JFK not to enforce the law requiring the Communist Party to register as agent of Soviet Union because such action would "damage freedom of thought, speech and association."** . . . Radio Liberty, beamed to Russia as U.S.-backed polwar operation, showing great journalistic enterprise upon Soviet busting of nuclear test moratorium, secured interviews with Norman Cousins and Dr. Linus Pauling (SANErs #1 and 2).

Now that Stalin's down, Trotsky may be moving up. There's a hint of it: a picture of Trotsky in the last issue of *USSR*, the Soviet magazine published in the U.S. (Russians may change name of *USSR*. Its poor newsstand draw, they think, comes from fact so few Americans—including some in high places?—know what USSR stands for.) . . . Appointed Chancellor of new University of Ghana, by Ghana President Kwame Nkrumah, that great educator, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah.

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly by National Review, Inc. at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. (second class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.). Copyright 1961 in the U.S.A., by National Review, Inc. All manuscripts, letters, subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

EDITORIAL AND CIRCULATION OFFICES
National Review
150 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone ORegon 9-7330

RATES: $15.00 a year ($8.00 for the 36-page issues, and $7.00 for the 8-page issues published on the alternate fortnight). The 8-page issues are available separately at $10.00 a year. In all cases, add $1.00 for Canada, $2.00 for other foreign subscriptions.

• Trends •

The outstanding fact of life in American politics today is the resurgence of the anti-Communist right.

In California, Dr. Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communist Crusade packs 18,000 people into the Los Angeles Coliseum for a patriotic rally; in Cincinnati, 7,000 anti-Communists turn out to hear Frank S. Meyer and other experts on Bolshevism; in Texas and elsewhere in the South, giant "indignation rallies" protest the training of Communist Yugoslav pilots in the United States. In Washington, a Senate subcommittee prepares to investigate Pentagon "muzzling" of anti-Communist military men —an inquiry forced by a torrent of mail from outraged citizens.

Such expressions of mass sentiment are the flower of two decades of frustration—frustration with a foreign policy committed to the proposition that this country, at all costs, must not offend the Soviet Union. The American people, clearly, have had more than enough, and are mobilizing their energies and their resources to change the drift of our national fortunes.

This is a development which, by Liberal hypothesis, could not happen. By this time the country should be educated to the "realities" of our "complex" age—*i.e.*, to the twin facts that Liberalism has no intention of winning the Cold War, or of giving way to leadership which will win it.

As ever, when dealing with anti-Communist phenomena, the Liberal Establishment has used a simple, two-phased strategy: ignore such developments as long as possible; then, when they can be no longer ignored, hit them with everything in the book. The nation has endured phase one for better than a decade; anti-Communist journalists and speakers have been presumed not to exist. Now, since they have at last succeeded in reaching the general public, the Establishment has switched to phase two—an all-out effort at destruction.

The Liberals selected their targets with care. Their effort has been to chivy out the most vulnerable segments of the anti-Communist movement and to serve up their crucified remains as representative of the whole. This effort began last spring, a synchronized exposé of Robert Welch's John Birch Society. The supposed sins of the Birch Society were then attributed to the hard anti-Communist movement as a whole. Result: anyone presuming to challenge the unrelieved folly of U.S. policy abroad is apt to be set down as believing President Eisenhower is a Communist agent.

The Birch explosion, however, did not do what the Liberals had hoped. The movement continued to roll forward, absorbing and neutralizing this first onslaught. It became clear that more was called for. The Kennedy Administration therefore set about to punish those within its reach who had collaborated in the preachment of anti-Communist doctrine. The humiliation of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was the first step—an action frankly intended, according to a "leaked" story in the *New York Times*, as an "example" to other officers of similar inclination. The "example" was soon made a matter of formal policy, as the now-famous Fulbright Memorandum forced a full-scale pogrom of anti-Communists in the Department of Defense.

It is testimony to the strength of the upsurge that all of these moves, despite strong support from most important opinion-shaping media, have backfired. Even the Birch Society, which has suffered the most from the onslaught, is reported to have picked up membership since the concerted attack began. Gen. Walker, rather than returning to America in disgrace, has become something of a national hero. The crackdown on the military generally has produced a wave of revulsion, leading to the aforementioned Senate inquest.

Clearly, the situation is becoming desperate. After a generation of presiding in suicidal fatuity over American destinies, the Left begins to sense a day of reckoning at hand. The people, somewhat ponderously and painfully, are moving to settle their account with those who have parlayed the nation's strength into an unbroken string of calamities.

The Establishment, abandoning the selective assault which marked its earlier efforts, has thus flung itself into a wanton attack against any and all who question the wisdom of continued appeasement. This is the real significance of the fact that President Kennedy, in an unprecedented confession of alarm, recently devoted two major speeches to scarifying the anti-Communists. Striking out at what he terms "discordant voices" and "extremists," the President suggested that he who questions the programmatic surrender of the free world to Communism is a dangerous fanatic. Kennedy claimed the backing of "most Americans" for these opinions, and dismissed the anti-Communists as "fringe" elements, representing no important tendency in the nation. But if the movement is so negligible, why should the President of the United States devote two major speeches to attacking it?

And why should the mass media suddenly ululate in feigned terror at the rise of conservative "radicalism"? Why, just a week after the President's blast at right-wing "extremists" did the two national organs which tend more and more to reflect Administration and Establishment thinking come out with long, deeply researched (and as deeply slanted) "reports" on what the *N.Y. Times Magazine* called "The Rampageous Right" and *Newsweek*, "Thunder on the Right—the Conservatives, the Radicals, the Fanatic Fringe"?

Clearly, John Kennedy, and the forces he represents, are scared. And if they do not reverse this nation's course quickly, they are likely to find things happening in America which will scare them even more.

M. Stanton Evans

• Abroad •

Kindu. When the UN, last week, decided to drop its idea of arresting the murderers of the thirteen Italian airmen, it could hardly have been for want of witnesses. Pierre Vincent, Congo correspondent of the left-wing, pro-Lumumbist French weekly, *L'Express,* thus describes the episode: "The massacre [of the Italians] was particularly abominable. When the mutinous soldiers, hopped up with drugs, seized them, the Italians pointed to their UN status. 'Dirty Flemish,' the Blacks retorted—the supreme insult in the mouth of a Congolese, who for some reason or other believes the Flemish to be 'sub-Belgians.' Then the Italians were beaten, tortured, thrown in jeeps and brought to the *Place Saio,* before the post office in the middle of Kindu. It was there that they were killed by a bullet in the neck, before thousands of wildly applauding inhabitants. After this they cut them in little pieces, in the presence of a more and more enthusiastic crowd of Blacks, and a handful of Whites, trembling with fear, who had apparently been forced to watch the spectacle on pain of losing their own lives. A non-Congolese was even invited to take photographs—which he did, pale as a shroud. When the butchery was finished, they distributed the choice bits: the hands were carved up and knuckle bones passed around like good luck charms. Some "Flemish" hands were served whole for a handful of the privileged: among them Colonel Vital Pakassa, leader of the mutineers, and also, according to certain reports, the European who represents the World Health Organization at Kindu." Kindu, incidentally, is the capital of the district of "Maniema," which means "land of the cannibals" in Swahili.

London. On Saturday, December 9, there will be a significant test of strength by the "Committee of 100," the more extreme (civil disobedience) wing of the unilateral disarmament movement. The Committee has called for simultaneous sitdowns at eight different missile bases on that day. It has further instructed its followers to refuse, when arrested, to put up bail or pay fines, in order to put a maximum strain on the country's police facilities.

Algiers. The economic meaning of an Algeria split from France is being foreshadowed by the statistics of this year's developments under de Gaulle's drive toward *Algérie Algérienne.* Algerian imports as a whole from France are down 17%; and in consumer durables (autos, refrigerators, washing machines, etc.)—the symbols of longer-term confidence—the drop is 50%. Private capital investment in Algeria for 1961 will total less than a half of what had been expected. Algerian bank deposits are down more than 20% from last year, and commercial bank loans are today about a third of the 1960 figure. For decades Algeria has been first in trade with metropolitan France. This year, she has dropped behind West Germany.

L'Express

"Aristotle contemplating the bust of Homer"

Brussels. Before taking off on his mission to the UN, Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak told the Belgian Senate a few of the curious facts about the UN's Swedish officials who have been so prominent in the Katanga operation. He noted, for example, that Sture Linner, whom Dag Hammarskjold appointed UN chief in the Congo, had long been associated with the Swedish firm, Grangesberg A/B. This company, along with Skanska Cement, Iforverken A/B and Boliden, forms a syndicate with the U. S. firm, International African-American Corporation. This syndicate, seeking copper and other mining concessions, has more or less openly pursued a pro-Lumumbist, anti-Tshombe line within the Congo. Boliden's President, Sven Schwarts, has made several recent trips to Katanga under the auspices of UN officials and the Swedish embassy. Spaak omitted from his Senate speech the allegation that European rumor finds juiciest: that Dag Hammarskjold's brother, Gustav (Bo), is associated not only with Grangesberg A/B but with the U. S. copper corporation, Anaconda Mining Co., and that the Grangesberg syndicate is also closely linked to major U. S. banking interests.

Oxford. The Left wing at the University hopes that it may have found the issue, capable of arousing "a mass wave of indignation," for which it has been waiting for some years. An undergraduette of St. Hilda's college has just been expelled after being found in bed with a young man. The University Labor Club is circulating a petition demanding her reinstatement, and there is talk of demonstrations and sitdowns.

• The Investor •

Lost or destroyed stock and bond certificates present problems for the investor, the extent of which is seldom realized until a loss has been sustained. Too many otherwise reasonably intelligent investors leave stock and bond certificates worth thousands and occasionally even hundreds of thousands of dollars in bureau drawers, in desks, or in file cabinets. Some keep all their holdings in this manner. Others put securities in insecure places on the way to a safe deposit box. Not infrequently the temporary resting place becomes permanent until one day the certificates have disappeared.

Recently, an older couple, clients of mine for more than a decade, decided to retire to Florida. When they went to their safe deposit box to gather up their stocks, several were missing. A frantic telephone informed me that these stock certificates had never been received. A quick check of our records produced receipts signed by one of the couple. What to do?

Dividends on the lost stocks have been regularly received, showing that, on the books of the transfer agent my clients are still the recognized owners. The first thing to do in a case of this sort is to request in writing a stop-transfer order signed by the registered owner. This helps to prevent transfer by any other person who might forge the owner's signature in an attempt to gain possession of new certificates. If the stock owner has already endorsed the certificates, transfer by anyone else is facilitated.

The next step is to apply to a casualty insurance company for a surety bond which guarantees the transfer agent against loss from further presentation of the certificates by a new owner who may claim he has acquired them legally. In applying for an insurance bond the applicant must report in detail all he knows about events leading up to discovery of the loss.

Not only is issuance of such surety bond likely to take many weeks, but the cost is 6% of the market value of the stock at the time of application. For example, it will cost my clients $600 for a surety bond since the market value of securities they lost is $10,000. This is the equivalent of two years' dividend income. Upon receipt of the bond, the transfer agent will issue duplicate new shares.

Growing numbers of medium and large investors are finding bank custodian services a sure and convenient way to avoid certificate losses. Custodian account handling of investment securities has many other significant advantages. Compared to its utility, the charge is modest.

The bank holds all certificates of a particular investor in separate envelopes in the bank's vaults. For convenience, stocks are usually registered in the name of the bank's nominee. This enables the bank to receive one dividend check for all clients who own shares in one company. Stock dividends are placed in the account and stock rights are exercised or disposed of according to the clients' wishes. If no instructions are received, immediately prior to expiration, stock rights are sold and the investor credited with the proceeds. Thus valuable stock rights are never allowed to expire with complete loss to the investor.

Changes in security holdings in a custody account may be effected through instructions to the bank from the investor or from his investment adviser. Sales are characteristically completed by delivery of shares only against payment by a broker and purchases are completed by cash payments from the account only when shares in "street name" are delivered by a broker to the bank.

Banks also provide a record-keeping service. Many investors maintain inadequate records. They do not have an up-to-date list of holdings and they fail to keep broker confirmations showing dates and prices on sales and purchases. When income tax time rolls around, there is a hurried search for lost confirmations and then a desperate last-minute call to a broker already snowed under by a myriad such calls.

The bank keeps a record of all transactions in an account and an up-to-date list of all holdings. As instructed, it will mail semi-annually, quarterly or monthly, a list of all transactions in a custody account, including dividends received. It will also periodically mail a current list of his holdings to each investor.

Occasionally an investor is reluctant to relinquish physical control of his securities in the belief that he is somehow limiting his own powers. In placing securities in a bank's custody, he does not give up any control. The custody account can be closed at any time or instructions previously given changed.

Bank charges for custody services vary from institution to institution, but generally do not vary widely in net cost. A $75 minimum annual charge is rather typical. The following is the schedule of annual fees for an individual's account:

Five dollars per each issue of stock or bonds plus 2½¢ per share for the first 10,000 shares of stock; 1¢ per share for the next 40,000 shares. Sixty cents per 1,000 for the first 500,000 bonds; 40¢ per 1,000 for the next 500,000, and an activity charge of $3 per transaction.

Investor custodian fees are directly deductible from current income for federal income tax purposes, as are fees paid investment advisers. Thus the net cost, after taxes, is usually considerably less than the apparent dollar cost.

Since fees depend in part on number of issues, the number of shares, and on the number of sale and purchase transactions, it is not possible accurately to predict an annual custody charge for, say, a $200,000 account or a $1 million account. By actual experience, a particular $200,000 account for the past year paid $275 in fees, and one $1.3 million account paid $857. These fees may be regarded as average for accounts of these sizes.

NORVIN R. GREENE